dow



ENGINEERING & PLANNING BRANCH FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

I. FUNCTION

1.

Manage a program which looks to the development of new equipments needed for the technical security programs of the Division.

ACTIVITY

For equipment developed in-house:

- A. Write the Request for Proposal.
- B. Evaluate proposals.
- C. Aid in negotiating the contract for the equipment.
- D. Serve as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative.
 - E. Monitor the performance of the contractor.
- F. Perform the acceptance testing for the equipment.

For research, development and engineering tasks done in our behalf by ORD and OTS:

- G. In conjunction with ORD or OTS, identify needed equipments.
- H. Together with ORD and OTS serve as contract monitors and observers.

II. FUNCTION

Provide budget and planning functions for the Division.

ACTIVITY

- A. Prepare Program Call; Annual budget and related papers.
- B. Prepare special studies such as a Technical Threat Assessment or a five year projection of technical equipment needs.

III. FUNCTION

Perform special technical liaison.

ACTIVITY

- A. Serve as an observer to the Technical Security Countermeasures Subcommittee's R&D Working Group.
- B. Serve as a member of the R&D Working Group's Threat Assessment Task Force.
- C. Serve as a member of the Special Reading Group.

I DENT IMPORTATION OF PREISE 2000/09/02: CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1	
The Technical Security Division comp that writes the Proposal Request for	
UCVELUDEW ID NOUCO more and	_
the technical security programs of the	e Division
ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 1 COMPONENT: OS /PTOS /Took in the	
EVALUATION: COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Division/EPB	Security
<u>DATE:</u>	
What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?	
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No	
this activity?	·
agency	
Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how?	No_X
Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transf to another OS component or to another Office? YesNoX	erred
Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less cost More properly? Yes No If so, which component and why?	tly? ?
Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No If so, what?	
Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? YesNoNo	
Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is important than this one? Yes No_X If so, what?	more

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component	
Approved For Release 2000/09/002-tCIAVRID RATEON823R000700020026-Redues ts to	
develop, in house, new equipments needed for the technical security program of the Divi	sion
ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 2 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Secur	ity
EVALUATION: Division/EPB DATE:	
	1
What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?	
25X1A	
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?	
agrey	
Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No If so, how?	_1_
Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes NoX	đ
	8
Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No If so, which component and why?	
Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No_X If so, what?	
Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X If so, how?	
•	1 1
Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No \times If so, what?	re '

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 t CHA-RDP83B00823R000700020026r1 the development of in-house designed equipments needed for the technical security programs of the Division ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b), 3 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB DATE: EVALUATION: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes Y Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No \times If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes____ No____ If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes____ No___ If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes____ No_X_ If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ___ No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

The Technical Security Division component that aids the contracting Officer in negot-

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component that serves as the contracting Officers Approved For Release 2000/09/02-1614-Rap 8380002 3870007 0002 0026-1 he development of in-house designed security equipments.

ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b), 4	COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
EVALUATION:	Division/EPB <u>DATE</u> :
What is (are) our reference(s) for	this activity? Date(s)?
Is (are) the reference(s) still in the Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of	force? Yes_K No this activity? Gyerry
Do you feel the activity is still not Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it Can the activity be done more efficient If so, how?	is still necessary? Yes X No
Do you feel that responsibility for to another OS component or to another if so, where and why?	the activity should be transferred her Office? Yes No
Can another component do the activit More properly? Yes No I	y more efficiently? Less costly? f so, which component and why?
Does the activity include anything q Watergate? YesNo_X_ If so	uestionable in the light of , what?
Can this activity be reduced in scop significant effect on overall Agen If so, how?	e/size or discontinued without cy security? YesNoX
Is there any activity not now being important than this one? Yes	oursued by OS that you feel is more No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: FICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : GIATRING 3E00823E000700020026-3 inches contractor in the development of in-house designed security equipment. ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 5 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: DATE: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes___ If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes_____ No_____ If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes____ No____ If so, how?

important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component Approved For Release 2000/09/02 CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026 testing of new equipments developed in-house for the Technical Security Programs of the Division. ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b), 6 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: DATE: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes____ No__X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more

important than this one? Yes

No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component that works in conjunction with ORD and/or Approved For Release 2000/09/073 CIA-RDP83B90823R000700020026pments.

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes K No	ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b); 7	OMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes K No Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No Tante activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X	ACTIVITI CODESTI, B, (b), F	Division/EPB
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No	EVALUATION:	<u>DATE</u> :
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No		
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No	What is (are) our reference(s) for th	is activity? Date(s)?
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity? Graph of the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X		
Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X No X	Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of	this activity?
Do (es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X NO Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X No X	Sign in the second seco	9
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes	Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is Can the activity be done more efficient	s still necessary? Yes X No
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes		
More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X	to another OS component or to anoth	he activity should be transferred er Office? YesNoX_
More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X		
Watergate? Yes No_X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No_X	Can another component do the activity More properly? Yes No I	more efficiently? Less costly? so, which component and why?
Watergate? Yes No_X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No_X		
significant effect on overall Agency security: ies RoX	Does the activity include anything question watergate? YesNo_X_ If so	nestionable in the light of what?
significant effect on overall Agency security: ies RoX		
11 30, 10w.	Can this activity be reduced in scope significant effect on overall Agend If so, how?	e/size or discontinued without by security? Yes No
Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No If so, what?	Is there any activity not now being print important than this one? Yes	oursued by OS that you feel is more No X If so, what?

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 :ttlAtRDR83B00823R0007Q0029926r1with ORD and OTS in monitoring contracts for new equipments ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b), 8 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: DATE: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes Y Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes_____ No____ If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No \(\) If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes____ No_____ If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

The Technical Security Division component

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 SCANADP83B00823E0007862002641ion of the Divisions Program Call.
25X1A
O le te
ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 9 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
Division/EPB
EVALUATION: DATE:
What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?
Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes No Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?
Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes No Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes No Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No If so, how?
Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No If so, where and why?
Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No If so, which component and why?
Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No If so, what?
Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No If so, how?
Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No If so, what?

FICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component Approved For Release 2000/09/02 responses BEORES B IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: Divisions annual budget. Delete 31 mar 75. ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b), 10 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: DATE: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes No Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes___ Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes. Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes_____ No____ If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes____ No___ If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes_____ No___ If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes____ No If so, what?

Approved For Release 2000/09	/02 CIA-RDP33B00823R0007600200261610n component responsible for preparing Special Studies such as a Technical threat assessment or
	a five year projection of technical equipment needs.
ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b), 11	COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Securit
EVALUATION:	Division/EPB <u>DATE</u> :
*	
) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A
Is (are) the reference(s) sti Who is (are) the beneficiary(ll in force? Yes \(\lambda\) No ies) of this activity?
*	agency
Do you feel the activity is so Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) for Can the activity be done more If so, how?	till necessary? Yes X No
Do you feel that responsibilit to another OS component or t If so, where and why?	ty for the activity should be transferred to another Office? YesNo
Can another component do the a More properly? Yes No_	ctivity more efficiently? Less costly? Y If so, which component and why?
Does the activity include anyt Watergate? Yes NoX_	thing questionable in the light of If so, what?
Can this activity be reduced i significant effect on overal If so, how?	n scope/size or discontinued without 1 Agency security? Yes NoX
Is there any activity not now important than this one? Ye	being pursued by OS that you feel is more s NoX If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

IDENTIFICATION	OF	ACTI	VITY	:
Approved F	or R	elease	2000/	09

25X1A ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 12 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes_X Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes_ If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes_____No__X If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes____ No____ If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes_____ No__X_ If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ___ No_X If so, what?

CATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component Approved For Release 2000/09/Q2 CIASED 823R000700020026 ion component R&D Working IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: Group's Threat Assessment Task Force. ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 13 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB **EVALUATION:** What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X Who is (are) the beneficiary (ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes_____No__X If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No (If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes____ No_ χ If so, how? Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more

important than this one? Yes____ No X If so, what?

Reading Group. ACTIVITY CODEIII, B, (b); 14 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB EVALUATION: What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No : Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity? Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X Do (es) the beneficiary (ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes If so, how? Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes____ No_____ If so, where and why? Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why? Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what? Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes____ No__X_ If so, how?

important than this one? Yes____ No_X If so, what?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more

R	OUTIN	G AND	RECOR	RD SHEET
SUBJECT: (Optianal)				
ROM: 25X1A			EXTENSION	NO.
20/(1/(
Policy and Plans G	roup		5311	18 March 1975
O: (Officer designation, room number, and vilding)	D	PATE	OFFICER'S	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED	INITIALS	to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB			17	Under Objective B57104 the Office of Security will re-
2. 25X1A			70 /	view and validate all Office of Security functions,
3. 4C 30				activitiesto ensure effect tiveness, economy and efficient The attached documents re-
4.				present two milestones under that objective. Milestone 1, the components identified the
5.				their functions and activitie Milestone 2 was establishmen of a format for evaluating
5.				theseactivities. It is requested that the Engineering and Planning Branch review
7.				the attachment and: a) Certify that there are no deletions/corrections
3.				additions to be made to the previous listing
9.				submitted by your office b) Review the Identification of Activity statement on
		6		each evaluation sheet to ensure it fully equals
).				to the comparable activity from your office
				listing. c) Use the attached format to evaluate each individu
				activity.
).				